DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 205 664 UD 021 610

TITLE	Nonpublic School Programs: English as a Second Language. ESEA Title I. Final Evaluation Report, 1979-1980.
INSTITUTION	New York City Board of Education, Brooklyn, N.Y. Office of Educational Evaluation.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Bilingual Education and Minority Languages Affairs (ED), Washington, D.C.: Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO	5001-64-01625
PUB DATE	[80]
NOTE	29p.: For related documents, see UD 021 593-596, UD 021 601-602, and UD 021 611.
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Bilingual Education: Class Organization: Curriculum Development: Elementary Secondary Education: *English (Second Language): *Hispanic Americans: *Private Schools: *Program Effectiveness: Program Evaluation: Second Language Instruction: *Spanish: Staff Development: Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS	Elementary Secondary Education Act Title I: *New York (New York)

ABSTRACT

This is an evaluation report on a Title I English as a second language program that served Spanish speaking students (grades K-8) in private schools in New York in 1979-1980. Section one of the report provides a description of the program. Data analysis methods and pre- and post-test scores are presented in the second section. The third section gives a summary of survey data and teacher interviews that includes: (1) information about teacher respondents: (2) a pupil profile: (3) information on various teaching methods used: and (4) a report on the role of support services and parents. In section four, observations regarding classroom and teacher characteristics are summarized. The fifth section contains a summary of interviews with the program coordinator and the field supervisor that cover issues including: (1) program organization: (2) instructional approaches: (3) student progress and retention: and (4) personnel considerations. The final section presents evaluation conclusions and general recommendations. (APM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED205664

OEE Evaluation Report

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

- This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
  Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R. Edmonds
NYC Public Schools

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

FINAL EVALUATION REPORT

ESEA Title I

Project Identification Number: 5001-64-01625

ESEA TITLE I

NONPUBLIC SCHOOL PROGRAMS

ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE

1979-1980

Director: Lawrence F. Larkin

Asst. Director: Margaret O. Weiss

Coordinator: Maria Mastrandrea

Prepared By The

ANCILLARY SERVICES EVALUATION UNIT

Sharon Walker, Manager
Prudence Ward Opperman, Evaluation Associate
Diane Grodinsky, Evaluation Assistant
Stanley Clawar, Consultant
Maximiliano Soriano, Consultant
Howard Spivak, Consultant

NEW YORK CITY PUBLIC SCHOOLS
Office of Educational Evaluation
Richard Guttenberg, Administrator

BOARD OF EDUCATION

OF

THE CITY OF NEW YORK

HON. JOSEPH G. BARKAN
President

HON. AMELIA ASHE

HON. ROBERT J. CHRISTEN

HON. IRENE IMPELLIZZERI

HON. MARJORIE A. LEWIS

HON. MIGUEL O. MARTINEZ

HON. JAMES F. REGAN

FRANK J. MACCHIAROLA
Chancellor

RICHARD F. HALVERSON
Deputy Chancellor

110 Livingston Street

Brooklyn, N. Y. 11201

Table of Contents

		Page
I.	Program Description	1
II.	Data Analysis	2
	Objectives and Tests Used	2
	Report and Analysis of Evaluation Results	2
III.	Summary of Survey Data and Teacher Interviews	4
	Introduction	4
	Information About Teacher Respondents	4
	Pupil Profile	6
	Teacher Methodology	8
	Support Services	12
	Parent Contact	13
	Recommendations	15
IV.	Classroom Observation Summary	17
	Classroom Characteristics	17
	General Observations	17
	Observation Checklist: Teacher	17
V.	Summary of Interviews with the Program Coordinator and Field Supervisor	19
	Introduction	19
	Program Considerations	19
	Instructional Considerations	20
	Student Considerations	21
	Personnel Considerations	22
	Recommendations	22
VI.	Evaluation Conclusions and Recommendations	24

I. PROGRAM DESCRIPTION

The Title I Nonpublic Schools English as a Second Language Program, also referred to as the ESL Program, served 3,360 nonpublic school students in grades K-8 at 86 sites. All the students, were Title I eligible and exhibited deficiences in the use of English language skills in the areas of listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Student language development was measured by an analysis of their scores on standardized pre- and posttests. The major component of the program was small group instruction (maximum of ten pupils) with a licensed ESL teacher. These groups met two to five times per week for a maximum of 60 minutes per session, depending on the severity of the language deficit.

The project funded salaries for teachers, supervisors, and administrative staff. The staff included one coordinator, one field supervisor, 51.4 full-time equivalent (FTE)* teachers, and two FTE secretaries. The funds for teaching materials (language games, textbooks, workbooks, pictures, and posters) and audio-visual resources (tape-recorders, film-strips, language master machines, records, and tapes) were also provided by the program.

*FTE: Full-time equivalent; one FTE is equivalent to one full-time staff position. Some teachers in the program are hired on a part-time or per diem basis; therefore, the amount of teaching service is expressed in FTE's in lieu of reporting the number of teachers employed.

II. DATA ANALYSIS

Objectives And Tests Used

Students were to improve in auditory skills as measured by their performance on the language subtest of the 1978 Test of Basic Experience (TOBE), level K for kindergarten and level L for grade 1; and their performance on the Total Auditory subtest of the 1973 Stanford Achievement Test (SAT), Primary I, Form A, for grades 2-8.

Report And Analysis Of Evaluation Results

Standardized tests: The program served 3,360 pupils according to records. Data were submitted for approximately 3,333 pupils. Valid pre- and posttest data on the TOBE or the SAT Auditory were obtained for 3,077 students. In addition 48 students were pre- and posttested on the SAT Reading Test Primary I, Form A Total Reading.

All raw score means increased from pretest to posttest. Correlated t-tests were performed on the raw scores for each instruments, all gains were statistically significant at the .01 level or better. (See Chart I.)

The program achieved its stated objectives.

CHART I

STANDARDIZED TEST SCORES FOR STUDENTS
IN THE ESL PROGRAM, GRADES K-8

Grade Levels		Raw Score Means Pre-test	Post-test	Gains
Kindergarten TOBE Level L	N= 412	7	15	8
Grade 1 TOBE Level L	N= 940	10	17	7
Grade 2 SAT Auditory	N= 716	26	37	11
Grade 3 SAT Auditory	N= 366	34	44	10
Grade 4 SAT Auditory	N= 206	32	42	10
Grade 5 SAT Auditory	N= 145	33	44	11
Grade 6 SAT Auditory	N= 107	33	45	12
Grade 7 SAT Auditory	N= 97	32	45	13
Grade 8 SAT Auditory	N= 88	26	44	18
All Grades	N=3077			

III. SUMMARY OF SURVEY DATA AND TEACHER INTERVIEWS

Introduction

Data were collected from 42 teachers who completed a questionnaire at a group meeting at the end of the school year. The questionnaire forms were constructed, pretested, and revised by the Office of Educational Evaluation with the assistance of Title I central nonpublic school administrators.

Data for the interview summaries were collected in eight schools. Each site visit included an observation of the Title I class and an interview with the teacher. The sites for this evaluation were selected randomly from a stratified sample of schools in the Title I English as a Second Language Program. The interview form was also constructed, pretested, and revised by the Office of Educational Evaluation with the assistance of the Title I central nonpublic school administrators. The interviewer was trained in the use of the form before the interviews began. The interviewed teachers were informed of the purpose of the interview: to feed back information to the program coordinators for administrative and evaluative purposes. The teachers were assured their responses would be reported anonymously.

Information About Teacher Respondents

Teaching Experience. Teachers were asked to indicate how many years of teaching experience they had. Responses to the teacher survey indicated that 26% of the teachers had one to five years total teaching experience; 43% had six to ten years experience; 21% had 11 to 15 years experience; 2%

had 16 to 20 years experience and 7% had more than 20 years teaching experience.

All interviewed teachers had a minimum of five years teaching experience. Sixty-three percent of the teachers had six to ten years experience, 13% had 11 to 15 years experience, 13% had 16 to 20 years experience, and 13% had more than 20 years experience.

Teaching Experience in the Title I ESL Program. Twelve percent of the survey respondents had been in the program one year, 15% had two years experience, 14% had three years experience, 14% had four years experience, and 52% had more than five years experience in the program.

Thirteen percent of the interviewed teachers had taught in the program for five years, 63% had been in the program for six to ten years, and 25% for 11 to 15 years.

Educational Background. The survey revealed that 12% of the teachers had only a BA/S degree, 10% had a BA/S degree and graduate credits, and 79% had a MA/S degree.

All of the interviewed teachers had a BA/S degree. Seventy-five percent had an MA/S degree, but the 25% teachers who did not have an MA/S degree did have at least 30 graduate credits in ESL. In addition, 50% of the teachers with an MA/S degree had also taken 12 or more graduate credits beyond the MA/S degree.

Professional Development and Activities. During the past three years, 86% of the survey respondents earned college credits, 12% attended Non-Title I Board of Education workshops, 26% attended UFT courses, 74% participated in Title I workshops, 43% attended local and national professional courses, 48% participated in publisher's materials workshops, and 45% took other non-credit courses.

During the past three years, all interviewed teachers were involved in some type of professional development: 75% of the teachers interviewed had taken courses for college credit; 50% indicated they were involved in some type of self-initiated professional activity; and 63% reported they had attended conferences or professional meetings, particularly the Teachers of English to Speakers of Other Language (TESOL) and the regional New York State English to Speakers of Other Language Bilingual Education Association meetings. One teacher taught ESL to Chinese adults and Vietnamese "boat people" and another teacher had traveled to a Spanish-speaking country. All teachers had attended staff training program meetings.

Pupil Profile

Number of Students Taught. The survey data indicated that each teacher was assigned approximately 59 students.

Information gathered from the interviews showed the number of students taught by any one teacher ranged from 52 to 65*. Seventy-five percent of the teachers taught at two sites and 25% of the teachers taught at only one site.

Criteria for Selection. In interviews, most Title I teachers (88%) responded that "limited English speaking" ability was a criterion for student selection into the program. The recommendations of the NPS classroom teacher (75%) and the Title I teacher (50%) were also identified as selection criteria.

*These results are based on the responses of seven of the eight teachers teachers interviewed.

Other criteria of selection reported by the eight interviewed teachers were: principal recommendations, low achievers in reading, low achievers in math, Spanish/English spoken in the home, severely disabled readers, and test results.

Participants in Selection. All interviewed teachers identified the Title I teacher as a participant in the selection of children for the program. Eighty-eight percent of the teachers recognized the classroom teacher and/or Title I guidelines as a determinant in the selection.

Of the 42 respondents to the survey, 98% indicated that the Title I teacher participated in the selection of the children in the program, 9% named the nonpublic school principal, 100% selected the classroom teacher, 17% named the guidance counselor and 43% named other Title I teachers.

Most Common Learning Problems. The survey listed eight learning problems and asked teachers to identify the three most common. The teachers' responses were as follows: problems from other achievement areas, 10%; attention problems, 19%; language problems, 81%; behavioral problems, 12%; poor listening skills, 34%; poor self-image, including fear of failure, 35%; retention skills, 33%; and general problems in concept formation, 29%.

The most commonly identified learning problems reported by the eight interviewed teachers were the four language skills; listening (86%), speaking (57%), reading (29%), and writing (29%). These were the only areas identified by more than one teacher. Additional problems mentioned were motor development, perceptual development, conceptual development, auditory discrimination, cognitive skills, motivation, following directions, transition from Spanish to English, vocabulary and language structure.

Teaching Methodology

Major Areas of Focus. The survey requested teachers to specify the major areas of focus for their instruction. The responses were: develop speaking skills, 100%; develop listening skills, 98%; conceptual development, 91%; develop cognitive skills, 83%; experiential development, 86%; develop writing skills, 64%; and develop reading skills, 64%.

All teachers interviewed named the four basic linguistic skills--listening, speaking, reading, and writing, as major areas of focus of instruction; 25% of the teachers indicated cognitive development as an area of focus. Other areas of focus named by 13% of the teachers included creativity and experiential development.

Motivation. When asked "What methods or techniques do you use to motivate your students?", surveyed teachers responded: games, 90.5%; graphs for self-tracking, 11.9%; reward systems (stars, stamps, etc.), 83.3%; use of manipulatives, 69.0%; and other pupil self-evaluative techniques, 31.0%. This question was followed by "If you have noticed behavioral changes that indicate increased motivation, check the two most obvious ones." The responses were: 26%, willingness to try more difficult materials; 71%, more pupil participation in Title I classroom activities; 17%, know what to do without asking; 29%, more attentive; 17%, greater rapport with teacher; and 38%, better self-image.

When the eight interviewed teachers were asked what methods or techniques were used to motivate students, many teachers responded "anything that will work." Specific motivation techniques included audio-visual aids (50%), games (50%), songs (38%), dramatizations (25%), language masters (25%), pictures (13%), and purposeful errors (13%).

The behavioral changes noticed by teachers that indicated increased motivation were increased participation (50%), "happy faces" (50%), and increased confidence (25%). Teachers also noted that students paid more attention (13%) and they seemed more mature (13%).

Peer Tutoring, Independent Study, and Individualized Instruction.

Teachers were asked if students were involved in peer tutoring, self-evaluations, or independent study. On the survey, the responses were: peer-tutoring, 52%; independent activities, 57%; and self-evaluation, 0%.

During the interviews most of the teachers (88%) indicated that their students participated in peer tutoring. This was usually informal, one student helping another. Seventy-five percent of the teachers reported that students evaluated themselves in some activities and 38% of the teachers indicated their students were involved in independent study (reading books independently, playing games independently, and/or doing rexographs independently).

Pupil Assessment. Table 1 summarizes the teachers' responses on the survey to pupil assessment methods. Surveyed teachers were asked to indicate the two major purposes of the initial pupil assessment: 38%, to individualize instruction; 40%, to organize group work; 21, to evaluate progress; 48%, lesson planning; 2%, record keeping; 40%, diagnosis; and 12%, teacher self-evaluation.

Eighty-eight percent of the eight interviewed teachers indicated that the Title I program assessment (Test of Basic Experience or the Stanford Achievement Test, was used to evaluate the pupil's ability. In addition, all interviewed teachers reported that students were also formally assessed by means of the Oral Teacher Interview and 63% of the teachers assessed their students informally during the first weeks of school through observation, picture discussions, games worksheets, etc.

TABLE 1

Percent of Title I ESL Teachers Using Various Assessments
At the Beginning of the Year and During the Year

Assessments	Method used at beginning of the year	Method used during year
Title I program assessment	55%	55%
An informal reading test	2%	10%
A standardized norm referenced test	79%	67%
A standardized criterion referenced test	10%	12%
A teacher made criterion referenced test	52%	50%
Conference with classroom teacher	76%	81%
Classroom observation	0%	74%

All of the eight interviewed teachers used the results of the initial assessment to individualize instruction, to organize group work, and to plan long range lessons. Fulfilling Title I guidelines and diagnosis were other purposes the teachers reported for the initial assessment.

During the interviews it was found that all teachers evaluated the students during the year through observations. Teachers observed classroom performance as well as out-of-class language performance. Thirty-eight percent of the teachers indicated they administered teacher-made or unit tests, 100% used the Spring administration of the SAT or TOBE test for reassessment, 25% distributed and evaluated rexograph sheets and 25% of the teachers based their reassessment on the evaluation grid.

Pupil reassessments were used by all interviewed teachers to individualize instruction, organize group work, and to fulfill the Title I guidelines.

Student Records. All interviewed teachers kept records of attendance, pre- and posttest standardized scores, individual profile charts, and pupil's work folders.

Most of the teachers kept records of parent conferences (88%), conferences with nonpublic school staff (88%), and referrals to supportive services.

Interviewed teachers were asked to identify their duties related to teaching. All teachers named the following duties as related to teaching: administer standardized tests, implement the instructional program, conduct needs assessments, organize instructional groups, write lesson plans, adapt or create materials, maintain pupil records, communicate with parents, and confer with classroom teachers.

Materials Used. All interviewed teachers were satisfied with the appropriateness of the materials and many in fact, gave high praise to the choice of materials. All teachers indicated that the Title I central staff and the Title I teacher chose the materials to be used. Some teachers volunteered that it was ultimately a joint effort between the central staff people and the teachers in the program; this issue was discussed at the general staff meetings.

Paraprofessionals. Of the six interviewed teachers who did not have paraprofessional assistance, two said they would like to have this assistance. It should be noted that paraprofessionals are employees of decentralized programs and as such, are hired, supervised and evaluated by community school district staff.

Paraprofessional staff when assigned by community school districts will, under the guidance of the Title I teacher: (1) work with the selected pupils on a one-to-one or small group basis on specifically planned activities geared to foster skills as diagnosed and taught by the Title I teacher; (2) assist with preparation of materials; and (3) assist with clerical and housekeeping tasks.

Pupil Selection. The pupil selection process was viewed as adequate by all teachers interviewed.

Support Services. The results of the survey asking teachers to specify all those who refer pupils to Clinical and Guidance Services were: 98%, ESL Title I teacher; 81%, other Title I teachers; 98%, classroom teachers; 81%, principals; and 21%, parents. When asked to rate the Clinical and Guidance Services the survey respondents indicated:

Extremely effective	- 19%
Very effective	- 37%
Somewhat effective	- 35%
Don't Know	- 9%

It was reported by the interviewed teachers that pupils are referred to Clinical and Guidance Services by the classroom teacher (75%) or the Title I teacher (63%). Often the ESL teacher would talk to the regular classroom teacher informally and then decide to jointly request clinical and guidance services. One teacher (13%) said she never involved herself in referrals. All but one of the interviewed teachers (87%) felt the Clinical and Guidance Services Program was effective. One teacher did not know the effectiveness of the services because she had never referred students to these services.

When asked what kind of support they received from the nonpublic school principal, the eight interviewed teachers generally spoke of the principal's cooperation. All of the interviewed teachers indicated that the principal provided orientation to school procedures. Eighty-eight percent of these teachers reported that the school principals encouraged coordination with the regular classroom teachers, initiated or were available for dialogue with the Title I teacher, and took care of scheduling matters.

On the survey, 86% of the teachers stated that the Title I central staff provided administrative visits, 89% reported supervisory guidance, 95% specified staff training meetings, and 98% named instructional materials.

The Title I central staff was reported by the interviewed teachers to provide: administrative visits (88%), supervisory guidance (88%), staff training (88%), and instructional materials (65%).

Parent Contact

Number and Frequency. The results of the survey indicate that the teachers meet an average of 35% of the parents. Thirty percent of the teachers reported seeing parents on a continuous basis, either weekly or monthly: 14.8% of the teachers saw some parents weekly; 16.2% reported monthly contact; 67.2% saw parents every reporting period; and 80.8% saw parents on a yearly basis.

The eight interviewed teachers met with 5% to 95% of the parents (four of the teachers met with 40%-50% of the parents). Seventy-five percent of the teachers reported that this contact was yearly, one teacher indicated weekly contact with some parents.

Method. Teachers, responding to the survey, indicated contact with the parents was face-to-face (78.3% of the teachers reporting); by

telephone (12.8%), by written communications (35.2%), and by parent-tutorial workshops (28.0%).

Interviewed teachers reported that they communicated with parents in a variety of ways: face-to-face (63%); telephone (38%); written communication/written progress reports (100%); parent-tutorial (13%); and through the classroom teacher (13%).

Initiation. Eighty-three percent of the Title I teachers indicated on the survey that they initiated the majority of teacher-parent contacts. In addition, 5% named the nonpublic school classroom teachers; 7% indicated the parents; and 2% reported the pupils initiated the majority of parent-teacher contacts.

All of the eight interviewed teachers indicated that contacts were initiated by the Title I teacher. One teacher indentified parents as making initial contacts, and one teacher identified the regular classroom teacher.

Interviewed teachers indicated that parents are typically involved in "individual conferences to discuss the child's progress." Seventy-five percent of the interviewed teachers indicated that parents visit the classroom to observe.

During the interviews the teachers were asked if parents were involved with their children in activities at home related to their classroom teaching. The teachers responded that they were sure some parents were involved because notes to parents with suggestions for reinforcing communicative activities were given to the children to take home at least one time each year. The teachers, however, could not give a clear indication as to the degree to which these activities were actually carried out.

Major Concerns of Parents. Most teachers indicated on the survey that parents were concerned that their children were approaching grade level academic performance (81%). Other concerns were promotion (0.5%, and obtaining special services (2%).

Interviewed teachers reported that parents are concerned that their children will master the English language (63%), can read (38%), will be able to function in regular classes (25%), will not lose the first language (25%), and will behave appropriately in the classroom (13%).

Recommendations

Survey results. On the survey, teachers were given six recommendations and asked to indicate which was most important for the improvement of the Title I English as a Second Language Program. The responses were:

(1) More Title I teacher involvement in materials selection - 38%*

(2) More opportunity for coordination with the classroom teacher - 26%

(3) More workshops based on Title I teacher input (re: teaching techniques) - 17%

(4) Fewer students more often - 12%

(5) No significant improvement is needed - 7%

(6) More opportunity for coordination with other Title I personnel - 2%

General. Most teachers interviewed responded that they were satisfied with the services given to children in the Title I Nonpublic School Program. Three teachers answered that the students needed more contact hours during the week.

Staff Development. Most teachers said that the staff development program was very good. Two (25%) said that although the staff development was good, they would like to have even more of it.

*It should be noted that teachers may not always be aware of the restrictions placed on the selection of materials by the Board of Education vendor guidelines and the federal restrictions on the content of materials in funded programs.

Coordination with Nonpublic School Classroom Teachers. The Title I teacher confers periodically with the nonpublic school classroom teacher to ascertain the specific needs and weaknesses of the assigned pupils. Evaluation of pupil achievement and progress reports are reviewed with nonpublic school staff. It should be noted that Constitutional limitations and judicial decisions determine the extent to which Title I staff are involved in the nonpublic school instructional program.

Coordination with Regular Classroom Teachers. The coordination with the regular classroom teacher, although informal, was ongoing and flexible. One teacher suggested the regular classroom teacher could observe some ESL classes.

IV. CLASSROOM OBSERVATION SUMMARY

Classroom Characteristics

Lighting was usually adequate. In one particularly dark room, however, the lights should have been turned on. Orderliness was apparent in all rooms. There were clearly delineated areas for different kinds of activities. The same somewhat dark classroom mentioned above was also rather small in space. It seems to be a converted hall/staircase. It was, however, being used as resourcefully and optimally as possible. Ventilation was generally good, with the exception of two classes which needed a little more air.

General Observations. Generally there was a greeting routine in which the days of the week, months of the year, and the numbers - both cardinal and ordinal - were practiced. The objective of most lessons was readily perceived. The materials were adequate for the lessons. The activities coincided with the lessons' objectives. Some teachers said their ESL methodology was either audiolingual or eclectic. They used Carolyn Graham's jazz chants effectively to develop pattern drills. The students appeared to enjoy these activities.

Observation Checklist: Teacher

The ESL classes were conducted according to a small group instructional model. Students were observed to be attentive to the teachers as they gave pre-activity directions or orientation comments. The teachers modeled appropriate linguistic behavior and provided encouragement and reinforcement through a variety of oral and written comments.

The teachers worked along with the children while sirging jazz chants, frequently taking a pupil's role while a pupil was the jazz chant leader. Pupils were observed to be attentive to other pupils during discussion periods and other activities. Pupils' work was displayed in all classrooms.

TABLE 2

OBSERVATION CHECKLIST: TEACHER (N=8)

Activities	% of Teachers Observed
1. Encourages children to work independently	75%
2. Enccurages children to work together	88%
3. Talks with children about their activities for the instruction period	100%
4. Works along with children	88%
5. Helps children solve academic problems	100%
6. Encourages/reinforces children in their work	100%
7. Gives feedback to children on their progress	100%
8. Pupil diagnosis/prescription	63%
9. General discussion with pupils	13%
10. Allows for pupil choice in activities	50%
11. Displays children's work in the classroom	100%

V. SUMMARY OF INTERVIEW WITH ESL PROGRAM COORDINATOR AND FIELD SUPERVISOR

Introduction

The interviews with the program coordinator and the field supervisor were both two and one-half hours long. The coordinator has been involved with this Title I program for 11 years - two years as a teacher, three years as a field supervisor, four years as acting coordinator, and one year as coordinator. The supervisor had been in the program as a teacher for six years and as a field supervisor for the past four months. Their responses are reported together when the two agree; when they disagree, their responses are differentiated.

Program Considerations

Goals. Both the field supervisor and the program coordinator identified the goal of the program to be instruction in English - providing the child with both a knowledge of the language as well as the culture. They added that the child is made to feel confident in adjusting to the new environment by having teachers refer to the pupils' native culture and help the child retain the native language. The development of these goals has been on-going. The Title I coordinators, teachers, administrators and general staff contribute to this on-going process. The field supervisor stated that the implementation of these goals has changed since the beginning of the program. Initially the focus of the instruction was audiolingual; today it is eclectic. The field supervisor stated the curriculum has changed since the beginning of the program and the goals have become more comprehensive.

Strengths and Needs. The greatest strength of the program was identified as the high level of teacher training and dynamics - all teachers have ESL skills. There are a variety of materials to meet the needs of the individual student, a result of the teachers' input in ordering these materials. In addition, the good organizational structure was seen as a strength of the program. When asked what parts of the instructional program were in need of strengthening, the field supervisor felt that he needed to spend more time in the field; he felt that there were too many non-field responsibilities which limited his time. The program coordinator also indicated a need for more time to see the teachers and make classroom observations. The program coordinator also felt that more teacher training demonstrations were needed so that the teachers could and would implement the curriculum more effectively.

Next year the curriculum is being revised. Some cognitive goals are being expanded or combined, and there will be modifications in the sequencing of instructional items.

Purpose of the Program Assessment. The program assessments give an overall picture of the students' achievement by testing the individual's receptive and productive language. The program used standardized tests and oral language interviews to diagnose and assess pupil achievement. The program coordinator feels, however, that the informal day-to-day evaluations provided the most meaningful assessments.

Instructional Considerations

Approaches to Instruction. An eclectic approach to instruction is utilized in the ESL program. This includes speakers, demonstrations, traditional teaching methods, jazz chants, textbooks, and silent reading.

Teachers stated that they used any method that would help to motivate the students. Audiolingual methods are also used.

Daily Lesson. The daily lesson is correlated to the curriculum guide and usually includes a greeting, review of items, audio-visual presentations, practice of newly taught items, and an evaluative summary.

Motivation. The coordinator and field supervisor were asked the question, "What methods and techniques are teachers expected to use in motivating students?". Their response was that teachers use any method and/or technique that is appropriate to the level of the students, and that will serve to motivate the students.

Overlap Between What is to be Taught and What is Tested. Regarding standardized program assessments, the overlap between what is taught and what is tested is rather limited in the SAT test, but a bit more satisfactory in the TOBE instrument. However, informal teacher assessments address themselves completely to the content that is taught.

Introducing New Ideas, Approaches, Topics. In the past three years, there has been a shift in the methodology from an audiolingual focus to one that is more eclectic, including greater emphasis on reading. New ideas, approaches, and topics were introduced after the initial assessment of need and followed by discussions, by groups of teachers interested in the curriculum and proposed changes.

Student Considerations

Reporting of Student Progress. Student progress is reported to students by immediate feedback and unit-end assessments. Feedback is given to parents at various times during the year through progress reports (See Appendix), parent meetings, and demonstration lessons. The principal as well as

the classroom teacher gets on-going feedback on the progress of the pupils.

Retention of Students. Retention of students is done according to the mandate to serve those with the greatest needs. There is no set rule for how long a student may remain in the program, but it is usually no more than three years. The total time may depend upon the amount of student-teacher contact.

Personnel Considerations

Supervisory Staff's Responsibilities. The supervisory staff makes site visits for the purpose of giving additional assistance and monitoring the program. Every teacher is formally evaluated once a year. The program coordinator stated that she meets regularly with the other Title I coordinators. In addition, the supervisory staff meet with the principals, the Title I staff, the paraprofessionals and parents to discuss aspects of the program and possible changes.

Strengths and Needs of Instructional Staff. The teachers' enthusiasm, their willingness to innovate, and their training are seen as the strengths of the instructional staff. The program coordinator stated that teachers need to become stronger in the area of record keeping. New forms were to be developed this coming year to help in this area. The field supervisor indicated that the teachers need to expand their awareness of the cultures of the pupil target population.

Recommendations

General. The program coordinator suggested that there be earlier identification of Title I eligible students, as well as an earlier allocation of monies. The field supervisor added that there is interference with the initial teacher placements because of budgetary problems.

Staff Development. Additional training sessions were recommended for the teachers. The field supervisor suggested more input from outside agencies.

Materials. It was recommended that more monies be allocated to allow a wider variety and a larger number of materials, especially textbooks.

Para-professional Services. The field supervisor recommended that para-professionals assigned to this program be screened adequately for linguistic preparation in order to serve as models for the pupils even though the Title I program has no control over the selection of para-professionals. This selection is made by the Community School Districts.

Pupil Selection. No recommendations were made in this area. Both the program coordinator and the field supervisor felt satisfied with this process.

Coordination with Regular Classroom Teachers. Although there is informal contact, the program coordinator suggested that structures be studied within the constraints of the present regulations to increase the communication between the ESL teacher and the regular classroom teacher.

Coordination with Other Title I Staff. The program coordinator felt that this coordination was good. The field supervisor recommended that the guidance personnel address the ESL staff. He also suggested that there be more interaction of cognitive skills gained in the ESL classes with those gained in reading, language arts, mathematics, etc.

VI. EVALUATION CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The Title I English as a Second Language Program offers teachers a wide variety of materials and approaches to utilize in teaching English. The teaching approach was characterized by the teachers and the program coordinator as eclectic. Overall, teachers appeared enthusiastic about the program and offered praise for the materials and staff development received during the year.

In all classrooms visited, teachers were observed encouraging and reinforcing children at work. The atmosphere in many of the classrooms was lively. Jazz chants were used effectively to develop pattern drills; children appeared to especially enjoy this activity.

A recommendation voiced by 26% of the teachers and the program coordinator was that efforts be made, within the program guidelines, to increase communications between the classroom teachers and English as a Second Language. The evaluation team supports this recommendation.

Regarding the implementation of the revised curriculum during the 1980-1981 year, the following recommendations are offered: 1) efforts should be made to monitor the implementation of the revised curriculum, 2) obtain feedback on the effectiveness of the curriculum from classroom teachers, and 3) the impact of the curriculum on program objectives should be assessed.

The last recommendation relates to the development of the program assessment instruments. The program coordinator stated the information presented on the standardized test, did not adequately overlap with the program's curriculum and instructional objectives. Therefore, it is recommended that the program administrators begin to develop more appropriate program assessments.